

Charles D. Cooper

R E M A R K S

UPON

BISHOP M'COSKRY'S SERMON,

PREACHED AT THE JUBILEE,

AND

CERTAIN OTHER MATTERS

CONNECTED WITH THE SO-CALLED

Representation from the American Church

TO THAT OF ENGLAND.

BY VERITAS.

NEW-YORK;

1853.



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2017 with funding from

This project is made possible by a grant from the Institute of Museum and Library Services as administered by the Pennsylvania Department of Education through the Office of Commonwealth Libraries

R E M A R K S

UPON

BISHOP M'COSKRY'S SERMON,

PREACHED AT THE JUBILEE,

AND

CERTAIN OTHER MATTERS

CONNECTED WITH THE SO-CALLED

Representation from the American Church

TO THAT OF ENGLAND.

BY VERITAS.

NEW-YORK;

1853.

REVIEW.

THE IMPORTANCE of this discourse is not found, so much in the ability which it displays, or in the doctrine which it proclaims, as in the ASSUMED position of its author, and the circumstances under which his opinions, therein contained, were given to the world. The share of originality or vigor which is here exhibited is certainly sufficiently moderate. An equal amount of flippant assertion has, more than once before, been put together in a single night; nor did the world greatly wonder at the result of such brief cogitations. The same views, in substance, have frequently been put forth during the last ten years on both sides of the Atlantic, with just as much of dogmatism, and just as little of argument to sustain them. It is more than probable that the author himself, in his own diocese had proclaimed substantially the same ideas previous to his departure for England; though undoubtedly the presence and communion of a Phillpots and a Wilberforce quickened and intensified his previous convictions. The *matter* of the discourse therefore does not constitute the necessity for any special notice of it. Although unsound, and in some of its views narrow and sectarian in spirit, it might have been delivered elsewhere, and allowed to sink into the obscurity to which, upon its own merits, it is justly entitled.

What then were the circumstances by which it has acquired

this factitious importance? A few sentences will be sufficient to reply to this question.

An American Bishop, regarded as representing the Episcopal Church of the United States, and naturally too, as a representative as well of the doctrine as of the prevalent standard of Christian courtesy in that Church, is kindly invited (as a stranger) to preach an Anniversary sermon of a certain Society, before the assembled heads of the Church of England. The object of this Society, the propagation of the Gospel in foreign parts, is one in which of course, all Christians and all churchmen of every shade of opinion and theological sentiment can unite harmoniously. The Society itself in past time recognizing this idea, has employed men, not only of all classes of opinion in the Anglican, but more than once from the continental churches. This object of the Society is naturally suggestive upon an Anniversary occasion of those topics in which all good men cordially unite: suggestive of love to those of our own ecclesiastical fold, and of good will and kind feeling towards those who, conscientiously, outside of this fold, are still striving with us to advance the kingdom of our common Master. To rejoice together in common over the progress of the Gospel of Christ during the last century and a half, is the avowed design for which these churchmen of different classes have met, and for which the preacher avowedly meets them. Truly, on such a day, and coming together for such a purpose, a simple looker-on, who had no suspicion of any thing but what he saw, would have anticipated only those topics which breathe of peace, and conciliation, and essential union; or at least of charity, and certainly of Christian courtesy.

But this expectation might well have been heightened in view of some other facts connected with this occasion. The preacher for the day was a stranger, and a guest of the Church of England. His very position should have closed his lips as to any dispute now up for discussion among its different parties. As a receiver of the courtesy and hospitality of all these par-

ties,* it was not to be credited that he would take advantage of this position to give one of his hosts a stab under the fifth rib, by way of ingratiating himself with the other; or even if meditating such an ungracious act, a regard for the occasion and a sense of shame, it might be supposed, would have deterred him from doing it publicly. That an English Bishop like Wilberforce should have been guilty of playing the partizan at such a time, and amid the ennobling associations of such a season, was outrage enough upon what our consecration service calls "man's natural sense of the fitness and decency of things."

But as to the more glaring and indecent outrage of the same act from a guest and a stranger, we have no language to express our conception of its enormity. We know of nothing with which to compare it, unless it is an oration on the era of our national jubilee, delivered in this country by an invited English orator in favor either of the principles of the Whig or the Democratic party. It is more than likely that both parties in this latter case would unite to hiss him down. But if, on the score of his position as a stranger and an invited guest, this were not done, those who were eulogized would be too much ashamed of him ever to make his speech a subject of boasting.

These pleasant anticipations of which we have spoken might well have been indulged on another score. The preacher of the day stood forth, and was regarded by others around, as the representative of the American Church. This position, as we shall show in its proper place, was a false one; but it was nevertheless that which he and his colleague chose to assume.† But this American Church has diversity of opinion among its members, as well as that of England. Nor is either

* "We were taken by the Bishop of London to Lambeth, and introduced to the Archbishop of Canterbury, by whom we were kindly and courteously welcomed to England, and invited to his palace."—*Bishop DeLancey's Report*.

† "Christ's holy Church in America which, at present, is so worthily represented by you in this country."—*Speech of Dr. Jackson at Oxford when presenting the gold salver*.

of the two great parties so small as to be ignored by one who professes to represent the whole. He can only represent them by insisting upon what they hold in common; unless, Proteus-like, he is Protestant with Sumner, and Tractarian with Phillips. A fair and truthful representation of the sentiment of the American Church, therefore, if not good taste and courtesy towards that of England, would have forbidden every thing like partizanship upon such an occasion, and under such circumstances. A large majority of this Church repudiate and abhor the unchurching and the invariable baptismal regenerating dogma: and to represent the whole Church by positively misrepresenting this large majority upon these two points, is, to say the least, a representation of a very doubtful character. But there was a still more special reason,

"As a gift to the Church we represent, we receive it."—*Bp. McCloskey's reply.*

"We shall carry it to our distant homes and place it before those whom we unworthily represent."—*Bp. DeLancey.*

"You have come the honored representatives of a Church which is one with our own."—*Secretary Hawkins' Address.*

"The real, if not the formal representatives of more than thirty Bishops."—*Ibid.*

"The whole Church of England welcomes with cordial delight the presence of the Right Rev. Prelates, who here represent the sister Church of America."—*Bp. of London.*

"The day that Bishop DeLancey came to represent the American Church was what Englishmen call Waterloo day."—*Bp. of Exeter.*

"The American Church has this year sent a deputation of two Bishops and one Presbyterian to join in the jubilee of this Society."—*Dr. Hook.*

"He had not the honor of being appointed one of the delegates to the jubilee of this Society, although he was present when those appointments were made; but he could speak of the almost audible pulsations of the hearts of the devoted children of the Church of America, when they heard how their representatives had been received."—*Bp. Whittingham.*

This last statement is astonishingly remarkable. How could Bishop Whittingham say, or the two other Bishops imply that they were in any sense representatives of the *whole* Church, either by sentiment or by appointment? Why was not the fact stated or alluded to that they were merely requested by one-third of the Bishops to attend the jubilee, and that the sentiments of even this one-third were not correctly represented? What a remarkable coincidence that only one class of American Churchmen, and they of the highest type, should have made their appearance at this jubilee!

if possible, for avoiding points of disagreement, and above all, of one particular point of disagreement. A certain great question had just been agitating the Church of England to its very foundation. It had been made the subject of a tedious legal process; the result of this process being a decision to the effect that both parties might lawfully hold and teach their respective opinions. The presiding officer of the meeting, who, it was well known, agreed in this opinion with the court, had been brought into direct conflict with another prominent officer of the Society present. "Certainly," we may suppose right-minded English Churchmen of all classes to have argued, "certainly our brother from abroad will meet with us in peace, and in a spirit of conciliation and forbearance will say and do nothing at this time and under these circumstances which will remind us of our own unhappy dissensions, and which will implicate his own Church in these our existing difficulties. Differences there may be, and there are; but now we would forget them." Shall the sword devour for ever? Are there not at least hallowed times and seasons when Ephraim may cease from vexing Judah, and Judah from retaliating upon Ephraim? Delightful and not unseasonable anticipations of good, yet simple-minded men! How were they fulfilled? First, the venerable Society itself is insulted. It is given to understand that there is *one* Church, to the rulers of which *alone* is given the power of government and regulation, this power being *essential* to the Church's existence: "*all* other associations not being of God." Consequently, when this Society sent out Swartz and others to build up Lutheran and Moravian congregations among the heathen, they were building up associations not of God: and as there are but two kinds of ecclesiastical associations in this world, it follows that they were engaged in setting up synagogues of Satan. The same outrage, in fact, being put, in these associations, upon the whole Church of England, which up to the time of Laud, never denied the validity of continental orders, and in more cases than one admitted these continental clergy

to minister at her altars without re-ordination ; and which, with the exception of a factious minority, since that day has neither held nor proclaimed any other opinion ; which within the last few years, in the case of Martin versus Escott, has fully admitted the validity of dissenting baptism, and in the matter of the Bishop of Jerusalem, acted upon the presumption of the proper ecclesiastical character of one of the continental churches. But it may be said that this insult, if it were one, was received by a majority of the Society with great delight.* We are well aware of this. The reader will find before we have done that the explanation of this fact is in no way remarkable.

That Society, in the mysterious providence of God, has been allowed to fall under the control of men who have no sympathy with many of its former Protestant actions and principles. Some thirty years ago, when Bishop Mant's work on Baptismal Regeneration was adopted as one of the Society's publications, two of his opponents, Biddolph and Scott, proclaimed to the world, and made the fact evident by quotations from previous issues of the Society, that an upward movement had taken place. There has been no retrogression since. While, like the Episcopal Sunday School Union in this country, a *professedly* General Institution, it is really the organ of a party : Bishop Chase, the late nominal head of the one, having as much sympathy with its principles as Archbishop Sumner with those of the other. The apparent anomaly is thus

* "The sermon was preached by the Bishop of Michigan, whose commanding figure, powerful voice, and fearless enunciation of truth and duty, filled the eyes, and ears, and hearts of multitudes with joy and admiration."

Compliments are cheap to the giver and dear to the receiver. Cannot the Bishop of Michigan, when he draws up *his* account of the jubilee, make some worthy return to his brother of Western New York for this complimentary description ?

"The distinct, emphatic, and uncompromising way in which the Bishop announced the doctrine of baptismal regeneration, and the evident intention which he displayed to make himself clearly understood on this point, created a deep and marked impression on the congregation."—*Chronicle*.

easily explained. Nothing could have been more gratifying to some of the present rulers of that Society than the course which the Bishop of Michigan actually pursued. It may have been suggested. What could have been more in accordance with the spirit of those with whom we find him fraternizing and toasting so cordially at Oxford? What a fine opportunity for these Oxford malcontents, through their American mouth-piece, to cast disrespect upon the Archbishop, and the Gorham decision!

Some sort of a lame excuse, such as it is, may therefore be offered for that portion of the sermon, so far as regards disrespect to the Society: none, however, when viewed with reference to the general current of sentiment and legislation both in the English and American churches. But what excuse could be imagined for the indelicate thrusting forward of the unhappy controversy of the day, taking sides in that controversy, affirming that the grace of God is given to every child in baptism without exception? What excuse can be made for this, in view of the fact that the presiding officer of the occasion, as well as the highest court of ecclesiastical judicature, had only a short time before decided that such was not the doctrine of the Church of England? Well might some of those who were present bow down their heads in shame at such gross indelicacy. And most clearly did the applause and delight of others prove that the essential spirit of the bigot Jane, and of the demagogue Sacheverell, still lived in the bosom of some of those who have inherited their theological and ecclesiastical opinions.

Now all this would have been bad enough had the general sentiment of the American Church been fairly represented. It would have been in bad taste, and a gross breach of the privilege of a guest, and an unwarrantable intrusion into family quarrels, even if it could have been affirmed that the sermon exhibited the universal or even the general sentiment of the Church which the Bishop professed to represent. But is such the fact? When and where, either by diocesan or general

legislation, has the unchurching dogma, in this country, been promulgated? Where is the prevailing sentiment among our clergy that would sustain the unqualified and arrogant assumption that all other Christian bodies around us are not of God? Where, again, does the practice of this Church deny the validity of the Sacramental acts of any or of all of these ecclesiastical bodies? Where, except among those who have provoked such opposition by their own unchristian bigotry and exclusiveness, can it be said that these Christians of other names obstruct our progress? Where, again, has it been assumed or asserted by legislation or otherwise, that every baptized infant is, at the time of baptism, spiritually regenerated? This sermon not only insults a large portion of the English Church, and the decision of her highest tribunal, by officiously intermeddling in a question then under agitation, but it misrepresented the doctrine and feeling of a large portion of the Church in America. Standing forth as the representative of the whole Church, Bishop McCoskry merely represented a party in it; and that by no means the largest or most respectable. Received, on the other hand, in this character of general representative by the whole Church of England, he ignored the existence and rights of all portions of it, except that which sympathized with his own party in this country. While assuming this general position, and received as properly occupying it, he was in reality nothing more than the agent of a party in America to help out the cause of another party in England; both of these parties misrepresenting and caricaturing the great cardinal doctrines of the two churches which they respectively profess to comprehend.

But the fact is, this misrepresentation of the sentiment of the whole American Church, is not the only thing in this affair which has been misunderstood. There was, practically, a misrepresentation, whether intentional or not, of his own position. He was, in no true sense of the word, commissioned by the American Church. Of thirty bishops, ten met informally—not by appointment of the senior Bishop, but by

request of Bishop Brownell, next in order of seniority—to consult together in regard to this matter. This meeting could not, even if every Bishop had been present, and called together in the most formal manner, have appointed a delegate from the other orders in the American Church. *Ecclesia* is not in *Episcopo* in such matters. Neither could one-third of the House of Bishops properly send a representative of that house. This was felt and admitted at the time.

Certain resolutions, however, were passed, and Bishops McCoskry and De Lancey were requested to be present at the services. This request, however, was virtually withdrawn, when the appointment of Bishop Doane's coming trial was made known to the meeting; and Dr. Wainwright, the Secretary, was deputed to this office in their place.

When the Bishop of Michigan started off to Illinois, more than one thousand miles distant, to induce Bishop Chase to postpone the trial, or, as he asserts, solely for the purpose of handing him a letter from Mr. Wharton, he was well aware that the meeting of Bishops was adjourned, under the distinct impression that he would not go; and that a postponement of the coming trial was regarded by them as uncanonical. Between himself and Mr. Wharton, Bishop Doane's lawyer, he procured this postponement,*—appointed himself and colleague *de novo*, although Dr Wainwright had already started,

* Bishop McCoskry, as we have intimated above, tells us, in his decision in the Doane case, that he had no other agency in the postponement of the trial, than "simply to present the letter, addressed to me by the counsel of Bishop Doane, to the presiding Bishop. Having handed him this letter, "he," the presiding Bishop, "was left to his own judgment." Let us hear Bishop Wainwright's account of the matter:—"The Bishop of Michigan was most anxious to attend the Jubilee, and told him that if he could only be present at that glorious service, in Westminster Abbey, he would, without a murmur, return to Liverpool the same night, by rail, and re-embark for America. (cheers.) The Right Reverend Prelate could not rest satisfied; and, having travelled one thousand miles *for the purpose*, accomplished the postponement of the trial until October. (loud cheers.) Having mentioned the Bishop of New Jersey, he would just say that he believed him to be entirely innocent of the charges brought against him; and that his character

and, at the same time, created a plea, by which his friend, the Bishop of New Jersey, managed to escape trial; which plea was the unlawfulness of a postponement, which postponement had been thus urged by his friends and counsel—a pledge being given at the time that it should prove no bar to the regular course of justice!! To sum up, he was no regular representative, by appointment, of the American Church; but allowed himself to be so regarded, and, in his speech at Oxford, virtually assumed this position. Assuming this position, he did not correctly represent this Church; but stood forth as the exponent of an exclusive party, to the gratification and delight of another party, equally bigoted and exclusive, but to the shame and mortification of all moderate men of both Churches. If it be said, in reply to this, that the two Bishops could not avoid being thus regarded by their friends in England, the answer is obvious—nothing should have been done to strengthen that erroneous impression; and, when it was seen that such an impression existed, they should not have taken advantage of it, to convey the idea that the whole American Church, through its supposed agents, was prepared to sanction the semi-Romanism of Oxford.

Now, it is a matter of no little importance that both English and American Churchmen should clearly understand the state of things indicated by this sermon, and some of the accompanying facts.

There is on both sides of the Atlantic, an indefinite idea

would be more bright and glorious after his trial than it was before. (long continued cheering.)

This prediction is about as correct as an item of history which Dr. Hook has given us in regard to this same distinguished personage. His character was very much wanting in brightness and glory, "among them that are without," before the trial, or rather his temporary *escape* from it. Nor has this escape in the least improved it. But by what right did Dr. Wainwright assume the impropriety of a canonical presentation, and the innocence of a man canonically presented, when he did not know what the specific charges preferred against him were? Did he, in this way, vindicate his peculiar fitness for an office, which he will be called to occupy if another trial is ordered—that of an impartial judge?

prevailing, of some further movements, by which the two Churches may be brought into closer proximity. Some hints have been given that the Bishop of Oxford—about as correct

To show how Doctors of Divinity, as well as medicine, will sometimes disagree, we put in parallel columns four several accounts of this matter. The real indifference of Bishop McCoskry is very amusingly contrasted with the false impression made upon some of his friends, as to his anxiety for the postponement, in order that he might make his longed-for visit to England.

Bishop McCoskry:—"I was the original mover of the resolutions now before this Court. I withdrew them that I might have an opportunity to state what agency I had in the postponement of the trial. This was simply to present the letter addressed to me by the counsel of Bishop Doane, to the Presiding Bishop. The whole matter was left to his judgment. In the application made by the counsel, there was a distinct and positive declaration made, that whatever doubts might exist as to the power of the Presiding Bishop, no advantage would be taken by him or Bishop Doane."

Dr. Wainwright:—"The Bishop of Michigan was most anxious to attend the Jubilee; and told him, that if he could only be present at that glorious service in Westminster Abbey, he would, without a murmur, return to Liverpool the same night by rail, and re-embark for America. (cheers). The Right Rev. Prelate could not rest satisfied; and, having travelled one thousand miles for the purpose, accomplished the postponement of the trial until October. (loud cheers). Having mentioned the Bishop of New Jersey, he would just say, that he believed him to be entirely innocent of the charges brought against him; and that his character would be more bright and glorious after his trial than it was before."

Rev. Mr. Southard:—"In consequence of statements which were made in some of the secular and religious papers, respecting the postponement of the trial of Bishop Doane, I sought an interview with Bishop McCoskry, on the deck of the steamer *Atlantia*, before she sailed; and inquired at whose instance, and on what ground, the postponement had been granted by the Bishop of Illinois? He told me that it was at his own instance, and that of Mr. Wharton, who has been a legal adviser of Bishop Doane, but *not* at the instance of Bishop Doane; it being expressly understood that Bishop Doane was *adverse* to a postponement on his own account, but would acquiesce that others might be suited, and would take no advantage of the change, if the postponement should be granted."

Bishop Chase:—"Let two or three or a half dozen visits more be made to Jubilee, by persons of judgment and true benevolence, similar to that with which I was favored by the Bishop of Michigan, just before he went to England—let the results of them be known to our Protestant *Communion*, and the matter of raising additional buildings to meet the present demand for the accommodation of the Students, as well as for ample endowment, will meet with but little difficulty."

How could dear Bishop Chase disoblige one who took such a long step merely to hand him a letter—and who, in addition, felt such deep interest in, and brought such material aid to, Jubilee?

an exponent of the Church of England as the Bishop of Michigan is of that in the United States—is either to appoint himself, or, by some party movement, so to be invited or appointed, that our next General Convention shall be favored by his presence and oratory. If his well known *soubriquet** be any indication of his skill, as a tactician, his party could not, for their purposes, send a more suitable man.

Not less insignificant, in this same direction, is the letter of Bishop Whittingham to the great meeting in London, presented by Dr. Wainwright. Pointing the same way, is an article in the New York Churchman, from a Canadian Tractarian, recommending the suspended Bishop of New York to appeal from the court which condemned him to the General Convention, or, better still, to a council of the Anglican, American, and Canadian Churches.

But the question very properly comes up—what kind of fraternity do these movements contemplate? They have all proceeded from one extreme section, corresponding in sentiment and doctrine in each church. Will those, by whom this section is opposed, be united in and by such movement? Or, will the thing be so managed that their sanction will be apparently given to extreme party movements, and be claimed in their favor? In other words, do these movements really contemplate fraternity and union, on a broad and catholic basis, between these two great Churches, in which all, except ultraists, can sympathize; or merely that of a party with a party—Doane, and Ives, and Whittingham, with Phillpots, and Keble and Pusey?

When Bishop McCoskry proclaimed doctrines repudiated by a large portion of one of these Churches, and, under the circumstances of the case, insulting to a large portion in the other—when the Bishop of Oxford, under similar circumstances, pursues the same course, what kind of fraternity is really indicated? Dexterous management, and flattering para-

* Σλίππερί Σαμ.

graphs in church papers, may give the impression to the unthinking, and to persons outside of the Church, that opinions thus thrust forth, and listened to in forbearing, yet disapproving courtesy, have really received general sanction—that they show the acquiescence of the whole Church in their correctness.*

But does not every intelligent man see that this is merely a partizan movement; and that the more actively and successfully employed in giving this false impression, the more does this party deserve to be repudiated? Can anything like Christian fraternity, or real success, come out of such practical falsehood. Can these two great Churches be brought together by the mere wire-working and log-rolling of theological demagogues and ecclesiastical tacticians? If we are to have union, let it be that of the two bodies, not of two miserable factions within these bodies. If such parties desire to unite and join forces, as they have a perfect right to do, let them do it openly and above board. Let no attempt be made to give the impression that such union implicates the whole Church, or has taken place under its positive sanction.†

* "He should be content with taking upon himself to assure the Right Rev. Father in God then present that they were surrounded in that room by Churchmen who revered their order, who loved their Church, and who felt it an honor to be able to record that the first pulpit from which an American Bishop preached the Gospel was the pulpit of the parish church of that town (loud applause). That preacher was George Washington Doane—a name much revered and respected in the English Church."

Here is a statement from Dr. Hook, illustrating the point upon which we have been insisting—a statement incorrect both in fact and opinion. Bishop Doane, and the Bishop of Virginia, had both preached in London before Bishop Doane preached at Leeds. He went over, also, not as a guest of the Church of England, to be welcomed by the Church, but as a known Tractarian, to preach for one of the leaders of that party. Respected and revered we trust he is by that party, for he certainly needs something of the kind. But intelligent men, everywhere, know the difference between England and Oxford, and between New Jersey and America. Dr. Hook's squib will have as little influence on this side of the Atlantic, as Dr. Wainwright's endorsement on the other, in preventing men from coming to their own conclusions in regard to Bishop Doane's guilt or innocence.

† One of our Church weeklies, in a glorification paragraph upon this sermon,

If the Tractarian party would pursue this course, openly and honestly, the friends of Protestantism in Europe and in America would have neither the right nor the desire to complain. Nay, they would rejoice; for they, in common with their opponents, would feel that the days of these opponents were numbered. It is a consciousness of weakness which has led to those extra efforts for party fraternity. Neither in England nor in America, does the Oxford party stand alone and upon its own foundation. They both feel their need of foreign aid, and of the apparent sanction of men to whom they are in heart opposed. These movements clearly indicate such a conviction.

Let the position of this party be clearly understood, and we shall see an outward adjustment—we shall see one portion of its members, the Judaizers, moving off to that corrupt and intolerant body to which they properly belong; and another, those of the Hophni and Phinehas school, becoming avowedly Protestant.

But, it may be asked, what is the proof of Bishop M'Coskry's sympathy with this extreme party? Did he not, some few years ago, make an open attack upon this very party, in his address at the New York Seminary? Assuredly he did, we reply; and, under the circumstances of the case, behaved with almost as much rudeness and discourtesy to that party, as in his last sermon he has done to the opposite party, and the whole Church. But the times have changed, and he has changed with them.

tells us that the author was a welcome guest of Archbishop Sumner, at Lambeth, and that he was invited by the Bishop of Winchester to repeat this particular sermon on some special occasion in his diocese. The latter of these stories we shall believe when we see it authenticated, as every one knows that the Bishop of Winchester has no sympathy with this doctrine. The former story is not improbable; because even if the Bishop of Michigan did forget his duty as a guest, it does not follow that the Archbishop of Canterbury neglected his as a host. But the hospitalities of Lambeth are not an endorsement of the unsound theology of any one of the guests, especially when it is well known that the host has openly proclaimed his dissent from such Theology. * See Appendix.

We shall briefly claim the reader's attention, while we indicate the nature of this change—while we show the identity of the doctrine of this discourse with that of certain writers whose position cannot be misunderstood, and its opposition to the views of certain other writers, of admitted authority in both Churches.

Our design, it will be understood, is not to prove the falsehood or truth of any of the opinions in question. No attempt at proof or argument is exhibited in the discourse. Its doctrines are simply asserted as true, and a counter assertion of their falsehood is of equal weight in point of argument.

But even if some show of argument had been made, it would not be our design, just now, to show its weakness, or its strength. We wish to identify these opinions with those which are of near kith and kin; to sort Bishop M'Coskry with his kind—to show the paternity of his catholicism—to make him, by this manifestation of his real views, go to his own place, and there, as a Tractarian known to be such, to coöperate with his Tractarian friends and brethren. In showing this identity, we shall confine ourselves to two points clearly brought out in this sermon—the doctrine of the Church, and that of Baptism. We shall by parallelism, enable the reader to form his own opinion.

DOCTRINE OF THE CHURCH.

M'OSKRY.

"Ours has indeed been a continued warfare. We were left in the midst of those whose chief desire was to destroy the Church of God."

OXFORD TRACTATORS.

"At the present time these three classes of opponents have united their forces; and unbeliever, Papist, and Protestant dissenter, obeying Satan's bidding, are endeavoring to do that together, which they failed to do singly; namely, to overthrow and destroy our branch of the Catholic and Apostolic Church."—*Vol. 1st, Tracts for the Times*, No. 36.

STANDARD WRITERS OF THE CHURCHES OF ENGLAND AND AMERICA.

"Whatever some hotter spirits have thought of this since that time, yet we are very sure that not only those who penned the Articles, but the body of this Church, for half a century after, did, notwithstanding these irregularities, acknowledge the foreign churches, so constituted to be true churches, as to all the essentials of a

M'OSKRY.

"We must enter through the door which its Divine Head has opened; and we must enter by receiving from those whom He has constituted as His earthly representatives, the right to enter.

"To secure the existence and well being of all this family which is called the Church, its Head has left earthly rulers, commissioned with His own power to regulate and govern the different branches scattered throughout the world. To them *alone* is given the power."

"Episcopacy," the Bishop of Michigan considered, "was necessary not only for the well-being of the whole Church, but he conceived it to be essential to

OXFORD TRACTATORS.

"Any great and united efforts of our people are still made impossible by the wide prevalence around us of dissent and unbelief—Rome's two-fold legacy to our Church and nation."—*Willerforce, Bishop of Oxford.*

"We must necessarily consider none to be really ordained, who have not thus," *i.e.* episcopally, "and in actual succession from the Apostles been ordained."—*Tracts for the Times, Vol. 1st, No. 1.*

"No outward conduct, however consistent, can be a criterion to our mortal judgment of this un-earthly and mysterious privilege in regeneration. Therefore, when you bring me the case of religious dissenters, I rejoice at hearing of them. If they know no better, God, we trust will accept them, as He did the Shunamite. I wish, with all my heart, they partook the full blessings of the Church; but all my wishing cannot change God's appointments, and His appointment, I say, is this—that the Church visible should be the minister, and baptism the instrument of regeneration."—*Mr. (now Father) Newman.*

"To belong to Christ's Church, is not merely to entertain certain opinions, but to live indeed faithfully in a divinely constituted body, wherein the

STANDARD WRITERS OF
THE CHURCHES OF ENGLAND
AND AMERICA.

Church; and, therefore, the general words in which this part of the Article (XXIII.) is framed, seem to have been designed on purpose not to exclude them."—*Burnet's Exposition, undertaken by request of the Archbishop of Canterbury, read by him, and other Bishops and learned divines, and published with the strongest expressions of their approbation.*

"The only object which separateth ours"—*i.e.*, the true religion—"from others is Jesus Christ, in whom none but the Church doth believe, and whom none but the Church doth worship. If we go lower, we shall but add unto this certain casual, and variable accidents, which are not of the being, but make only for the happy being of the Church of God, either in deed, or in men's opinions and conceits. This is the error of all Popish definition that hitherto have been brought:" (and that of Palmer and M'Oskey,) "they define not the Church by what the Church essentially is, but by that wherein they imagine their own more perfect than the rest are."—*Hooker*

His accordant opinion in regard to the Scottish and French churches, has been quoted too frequently to bear repetition.

BISHOP M'OSKRY.

OXFORD TRACTATORS.

STANDARD WRITERS OF
THE CHURCHES OF ENG-
LAND AND AMERICA.

the very existence of that Church."—*Speech at Winchester.*

inner spiritual life of their own is quickened and maintained by gifts of God's grace, which are conveyed to them in their use of outward instruments of His appointment, and which do truly join all its faithful members to each other and to Him." *Bishop of Oxford's Sermon at the close of the Jubilee.*

"And this power is essential to the very existence of the family."

"Them that are without, God judgeth: but all the promises of God are to His Church. His grace is given in the Church—the Apostles and teachers sent from God are in His Church. We know nothing, from revelation, of any grace, any Christian ministry, any sacraments, or any salvation beyond the Church. They," *i.e.* the Church of Scotland, "with all of its sects, form no part of the Church of Christ. All the temporal enactments and powers of the whole world would not cure this fault, nor render them a portion of the Church of Christ."—*Palmer.*

"No amount of personal holiness, if it can even be acquired out of this family, or inward experience, or raptures, can make us members of the Church of Christ."

"So far from its being strange, that Protestant sects are not in Christ, in the same fulness that we are, it is more accordant to the scheme of the world that they should lie between us and heathenism. It would be strange if there were but two states—one absolutely of favor, and one of disfavor. One form of Paganism is better than another. The North American Indians are Theists; are, as such, more privileged than

"Neither have we cause to doubt but that as many as do walk according to this rule," *i.e.* in which all nominal Christian Churches are agreed. "neither overthrowing that which they have builded, by superinducing any damnable heresies thereupon, nor otherwise vitiating their holy faith with a lewd and wicked conversation—peace shall be upon them, and mercy and upon the Israel of God."—*Usher.*

"The different religious denominations of Christians in these states were left at full and equal liberty to model and organise their respective churches."—*Preface to Prayer-book.*

BISHOP M'COCKRY.

OXFORD TRACTATORS.

STANDARD WRITERS OF
THE CHURCHES OF ENGLAND
AND AMERICA.

Atheists. Mahometanism is a better religion than Hindooism; Judaism is better than Mahometanism. One may believe that long-established dissent affords, to such as are born and bred in it, a sort of pretext, and is attended with a portion of blessings, where there is no means of knowing better"—how very kind and considerate!—"which does not attach to those who cause divisions, found sects, or wantonly wander from the church to the meeting-house."—11 *Vol. Tracts*, No. 47.

"It must continue, as it has continued, until the Church is presented to Him, without spot or wrinkle, or any such thing."

"Christ never appointed two ways to heaven; nor did He build a Church to save some, and make another institution for other men's salvation. 'There is no other name given unto men whereby we must be saved, but the name of Jesus,' and that is no otherwise given under heaven than in the Church."—*Tract 57*

"There is greater weight and moment of Christianity in charity, than in all the doubtful questions about which the Protestant Churches have been puzzling themselves and biting and devouring each other since the days of the Reformation. Looking far beyond the distinction of sect or party, we should labor to imitate the great Creator, in regarding those of every nation, religion, and tongue, who fear Him, and work righteousness."—*Dr. Wm. Smith, one of the three revisers of the American Book of Common Prayer, President of the House of Deputies, and author of a volume of Sermons from which the above extracts are taken; published under sanction of General Convention.*

"All other associations are not of God."

"The term, 'Church,' as every one well acquainted with these

"In regard to episcopacy, I think it should be sustained, as the govern-

BISHOP M'OSKRY.

OXFORD TRACTATORS.

STANDARD WRITERS OF
THE CHURCHES OF ENG-
LAND AND AMERICA.

writers, well knows, being invariably applied to those ecclesiastical bodies episcopally governed, and denied to all others—the attempt to institute any form of ordination for it,” that is, episcopacy, “or to seek communion with Christ, through any non-episcopal ordination, is to be regarded, not as schism merely, but as an impossibility.”—*Froude*.

ment of the Church from the times of the Apostles; but without criminating the ministry of other Churches, as is the course taken by the Church of England.”—*Bishop White, another of these revisers*.

“If the clergy of the Church of England are ministers of the sanctuary, those who minister in dissenting houses are deceivers.”—*F. A. Glover*.

“I look forward with rapture to that auspicious day, when Protestants, opening their eyes upon their mutual agreement in all the essentials of belief, will forget past animosities, and cease to regard each other as of different communions.”—*Dr. Wharton, the other reviser*.

“There must be no choosing by us which part of Christ's appointments we shall select for use;—no deeming that Bishops may be needful at home, but that Presbyters will suffice for foreign work. There must be a perception, that for this great attempt, the very best of all instruments of service are required. Now they who acted on this principle, would have sent out to evangelise the world, not only chosen saints, but those chosen saints in the perfectness of the Divine order. The Apostolic office would have been felt to be every whit as needful as Apostolic gifts and graces.”—*S. Wilberforce, Bishop of Oxford*.

“It is not necessary to true charity, though much to be desired, that Christians should be of one mind, nor that all should be of the same denomination. We may live as brethren, though, as such, we do not commune together in all the ordinances of Christ. But to be truly His disciples, it is necessary we should love those who love Him, and because they love Him. It is a profitable and pleasing exercise of charity, to view with compassion the errors and mistakes of well-meaning people, and to love those who love the same Saviour, and who worship the same God.”—*Ibid.*

ON THE DOCTRINE OF BAPTISMAL REGENERATION.

M'COSKRY.

OXFORD TRACTATORS.

STANDARD WRITERS OF
THE ENGLISH AND AMERICAN CHURCHES.

"It," baptism, "is the *only* door of entrance. They," Christians, "are quickened into life and made ready to be born; and this can *only* be accomplished in holy baptism."

"Reader, if one may argue from the result, one should think that our Saviour added the words, "of water," with the very view that His Church should thence learn the truth, that regeneration is the gift of God, bestowed by Him in this life, in baptism only."—*Pusey*.

"In baptism those that come feignedly, and those that come unfeignedly, both be washed in the sacramental water; but both be not washed with the Holy Ghost, and clothed with Christ. Baptism is no perfect sacrament of regeneration, without there be as well the element of water, as the Holy Ghost spiritually regenerating the person that is baptized, which is signified by the said water."—*Cranmer*.

"Baptism, as the means of our union with Christ, is the act which conveys to us, either in immediate possession, or as an earnest, all of our subsequent spiritual blessings; transfers us from being children of wrath, to be children of grace."—*Ibid*.

"This sacrament, baptism, and all other, be but the confirmation of the promises which be in the person that receiveth the sacraments before, or else these external signs availeth nothing."—*Hoop-er*.

"In this ordinance every child is made a new creature in Christ Jesus. To guard against failures, the Spirit of God is given to every child in baptism, *without any exception*, not only to begin, but to carry on and complete the great work of their salvation. The relationship thus created will ever remain. It can never be shaken off in this world, however unworthy the members of this family may become. They will still remain children of God."

"Baptism is not a mere initiatory or significant rite, but is an appointed means for conveying the Holy Spirit. It is not merely an outward admission to an inward covenant, and an admission to privileges afterwards to be bestowed. It is not simply an admission to any covenant at all. It is an admission, an incorporation into the spiritual body of Christ, and so a spiritual act wherein Christ by his Spirit takes the baptized into Himself."—*Ibid*.

"It is neither the work of the priest, nor the nature of the sacrament, as of itself, that maketh us partakers of Christ's death, but only the faith of the receiver. In baptism, as the one part of that holy mystery is Christ's blood, so is the other part the material water: and therefore they be oftentimes severed, and the one is received without the other. By faith we are incorporated, or made one body with Jesus Christ, our Lord. Afterwards the same incorporation is assured unto us, and increased in baptism."—*Jewell*.

M'COSKRY.

OXFORD TRACTATORS.

STANDARD WRITERS OF
THE ENGLISH AND AMERICAN CHURCHES.

"In adults there must be previous qualifications. These are repentance, faith and obedience, or, in other words, conversion. But this is not regeneration, or the new birth."

"A mother sent to the missionary, Williams, in great agony, on her death-bed, on account of the infanticides of which she had been guilty when a heathen. 'I began to reason with her,' said he, 'and urged the consideration that she had done this when a heathen, and during the times of ignorance, which God winked at: but this afforded her no consolation. I then directed her to the faithful saying which is worthy of all acceptance, that 'Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners.' This imparted a little comfort, and after visiting her frequently, and directing her thoughts to that blood which cleanseth from all sin, I succeeded, by the blessing of God, in tranquilizing her troubled spirit; and she died about eight days after my first interview, animated with the hope that her sins, though many, were forgiven her. And what but the Gospel could have brought such consolation.' 'Consolation,' says Pusey, 'remarking upon this incident, 'is not the main object of the Gospel.' 'Pray what is its object? 'Yet,' says he, 'the Gospel would have brought much more consolation had this teacher known it all, and could have told her of the one baptism, for the remission of sins; that she had been washed, had been cleansed; and so could have declared authoritatively, without altering our Lord's own words, 'thy sins are forgiven.'"—*Ibid.*

"Though God does sometimes sanctify from the womb, as in Jeremy and John the Baptist, and sometimes in baptism, as he pleaseth; yet it is hard to affirm, as some do, that every elect infant doth ordinarily, before, or in baptism, receive initial regeneration and the seed of faith and grace. For if there were such a habit of grace then infused, it could not be so utterly lost or secreted as never to show itself, but by being attained by new instruction. But we may rather deem and judge that baptism is not actually effectual to justify and sanctify until the party do believe and embrace the promises."—*Usher.*

M'COSKEY.

"No amount of personal holiness—if it can ever be acquired out of this family—or inward experiences, or raptures, can make us members of the Church of Christ."

OXFORD TRACTATORS.

"No change of heart, or the affections, no repentance, however radical, no faith, no life, no love, come up to the idea of this birth from above; it takes them all in, and comprehends them all, and is itself more than all."—*Ibid.*

STANDARD WRITERS OF THE ENGLISH AND AMERICAN CHURCHES.

"The first great instrument of changing our whole nature into the state of grace, flesh into the Spirit, is a firm belief, and perfect assent to, and hearty entertainment of the promises of the Gospel. The Spirit of manifestation is not upon them," certain baptized persons, "and that," *i. e.*, the manifestation, "is the first effect of the Spirit whereby we can be called sons of God, or relations of Christ."—*Jeremy Taylor.*

"By baptism we be ingrafted into Christ, and thereby receive a principle of life, afterwards to be developed and enlarged by the farther influences of His grace.—*Wilberforce, B. J., (now Romanist.)*

"Though an external and ecclesiastical regeneration be effected, (*ex opere operato*,) by the mere administration of that holy sacrament, yet so is not an internal and habitual sanctification, and that whether we respect adult persons or infants."—*Bishop Ezekiel Hopkins.*

"To guard against failures, the Spirit of God is given to every child in baptism, without any exception.

"There is a true work effected in holy baptism, whereby heaven and earth are brought into union. Christ is truly born again in all his members, and the seed of the corrupt is superseded by that of the regenerate Adam."—*Ibid.*

"Regeneration is the change of a man's state, from a state of sin to a state of holiness; which, because it is an entrance upon a new kind or course of life, is fitly resembled to regeneration, or a new birth; to a new creation, the man being as it were quite changed, or made over again, so as not to be, as to the main purpose and design of his life, the same man as before." "When this," *i. e.*, the man, has thus turned from sin to God, "when this is done, and not before, they are said to be regenerate."—*Tillotson.*

M'OSKRY.

"Repentance, faith and obedience, in other words, conversion.

OXFORD TRACTATORS.

"Conversion is that change, or turning in man's individual being, whereby his will is altered, and in the place of the love of sin, comes the love of holiness. It was a process which belonged to the Jewish, as well as to the Christian covenant, &c."—*Ibid.*

STANDARD WRITERS OF
THE ENGLISH AND AMERICAN CHURCHES.

"Baptism is a solemn rite, appointed by our Saviour, for initiating persons into the Christian religion."—*Ibid.*

"It," conversion, "is accomplished by the influences of the Spirit: but only those *general* influences which are given to prepare the children of men, as distinguished from the special influences of His grace imparted in baptism. They prepare the way for the free accomplishment of that mighty change which makes them new creatures in Christ.

"Regeneration, on the other hand, is the specific gift of the Gospel. It is that new birth of humanity of which prophets had obscurely spoken, and which was bestowed in the fulness of time, through His coming who was the true heir of the household of God. Our regeneration is connected in Scripture with holy baptism, because in that ordinance men enter into the first possession of those gifts which entered to all his members from the mystic head. In two places only of holy writ does the word occur; and it has plain reference to that re-creation of man's common nature which was wrought in Christ. Regeneration, therefore, is essential to conversion, because that alteration of heart, whereby every individual obeys the Gospel, derives its impulse from the divine renewal of humanity at large."—*Wilberforce, R. J.*

"Baptism is an holy institution of Christ, for the benefit of believers, and their seed, wherein by washing with water, in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, is signified the inward purification of the soul, by the blood and spirit of Christ."—*Burkitt.*

"Baptism is the engrafting of our human nature on the human nature of our Lord. In baptism there is conferred a spiritual constitution with spi-

"I never could discover that the Holy Scriptures authorise the belief that every one who is born of water, is, of course, born of the Spirit; and, to all

M'COSKEY.

OXFORD TRACTATORS.

STANDARD WRITERS OF
THE ENGLISH AND AMER-
ICAN CHURCHES.

ritual faculties. Baptism is to be considered as conveying to us the Holy Spirit. — *Tract No. 171. P. 2. Tract Society, New York.*

"Baptism is a new birth by which we enter into the new world, the new creation, the blessings, and spiritualities of the kingdom. Those also are regenerated to whom baptism is rightly administered, notwithstanding by their future conduct they may forfeit the privilege of their new birth."

"They are thus quickened into life, and ready to be born; and this can only be accomplished in Holy Baptism."

"There can, therefore, never be a second regeneration, or new birth, but there may be many conversions."

"Then it may be satisfactorily argued, from the highest authority, that baptism is the vehicle of regeneration. Why should we look for another?"

"I see not how we are to evade the consequence that the outward washing of baptism is attended by sanctification of the Spirit, and that we are born of water and of the Spirit, when we are baptized; which confirms an opinion presently to be insisted on, that no other than baptismal regeneration is possible in this world."—*Bishop Mant.*

human appearance, observation and experience prove the contrary. In my judgment, nothing is more clearly taught in the standards of our Church, nor can be, than that the sacraments—as well the one surely as the other—are of no spiritual benefit to those who receive them without the faith, and repentance, and charity, which God's Word requires. The very Article which declares that they are sure witnesses and effectual signs of grace, and of God's good will to us, by the which He doth invisibly work in us," declares that "in such only as worthily receive them, they have a wholesome effect and operation."—*Bishop Griswold.*

"'Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter the kingdom of God.'" Therefore he that is born of water is born of the Spirit. Such is the logic which demonstrates the identity of spiritual and baptismal regeneration. Let us apply the same mode of reasoning to a similar proposition:—'Except a man be a hearer of the law, and a doer of the law, he cannot enter into the kingdom of heaven.' Therefore, he that is a hearer of the law is a doer of the law. Can any one point out the difference in legitimacy of conclusion between the two cases?"—*Editor of the Repertory, supposed to be Dr. Wm. H. Wilmer.*

"Others, again, and these we believe to be by far the most numerous, consider that regeneration, as applied to the effect of baptism, is to be understood, not as an operation of the Spirit upon the soul of the child, or adult, but as that advantageous change in our spiritual condition, produced by the death of Christ, and secured to us in the ordinance of baptism. We believe this to be the most prevalent opinion of the ministers and members of the Church in this country."—*Bishop Meade.*

"In the sacrament of baptism, we are taken from the world where we had no claim to the favor of God, and are placed in a state of salvation in the Christian church; where, on the conditions of true repentance and faith, we enjoy a title to all the blessings and privileges of the Gospel Covenant. In this sense, as it respects a change of state, baptized persons are *regenerated*."—*Bishop Hobart.*

"The expressions in the prayer," that is used in Confirmation, "are liable to be misunderstood, and create serious objections on the part of many, I have found, to using the ordinance."—*Ibid.*

"The object of the proposed prayer"—a substitute offered by him, and running thus:—"Almighty and ever-living God, who has vouchsafed, in baptism, to regenerate these, thy servants, by water and the Holy Ghost, *thus giving them a title to all the blessings of thy covenant,*" &c.—"the object of this proposed prayer was, not to relinquish the expression of regeneration, as applied to baptism, but to guard against the misconstruction that would make this synonymous with renovation, sanctification, or any other term by which the renewing of the Holy Ghost might be denoted."—*Ibid.*

We introduce this last quotation from Bishop Hobart, not with the intention of being understood to affirm, that he never made use of expressions which seemed, and which, in reality, when put under the screws of logic, were not inconsistent with it. His sympathies and tendencies, if not his definitions, were all towards the extreme reached by Bishop M'Coskry, and his Oxford teachers. We have brought forward these passages for two reasons—1st, to show the development which has taken place in one style of churchmanship, within the last twenty or twenty-five years; and, secondly, to show how far the calmly-weighed declarations of a leader condemn the extravagancies and follies of some of his followers.

We have made the quotation from Bishop Mant, not because he is now so well known, especially in this country, as identified with Oxford theology; but the fact is, so far as regards the present movement, he seems to have been the originator. "So completely," says Mr. Goode, "was his tract on baptism, which gave this controversy its first impulse, opposed to the previous publications of the Society, that an attempt was secretly made to introduce alterations in the phraseology of some of the oldest tracts on the list, to make them consistent with the doctrine of the new tract. Thus, in 'Nelson's Com-

panion for Festivals and Fasts,' the word, 'regeneration,' was, without notice, changed to 'renovation.' And Bishop Bradford's tract on baptismal and spiritual regeneration, which, in 1810, the Society had pronounced to be judicious and scriptural, somehow became out of print, until a reclamation reproduced it, when it appeared without the advertisement previously attached to it. The late excellent Mr. Bidulph, in his reply to Dr. Mant's tract, gave extracts from forty-eight of the Society's publications—among which nine were by Archbishops and Bishops, opposing the doctrine of the new tract. The doctrine of Dr. Mant, however, was, with some parties at that time, the more popular of the two; and from that day to this, the most strenuous efforts have been made by its supporters to get it recognised as the doctrine of our Church. Dr. Mant's tract was a fitting pioneer for its Oxford successors some twenty years after; and it is a remarkable indication of the progress of the Romanizing current in our country that what was then carefully vindicated from the charge of having a Rome-ward tendency, is now unblushingly put forward by a Bishop of our Church, Phillpots, as a doctrine in which we are agreed with Rome." Not less remarkable, as indicative of the same Rome-ward tendency, has been the progress of opinion in the American Church as to this very tract. We, however, have not gone as far as our English brethren, at least in theory. When Dr. Mant's tract came out, our High-Churchmen disavowed its sentiments. Now they assert it to be the doctrine of the Church and of Scripture. Would that they had the logic, and, with it, the honesty and the boldness of the Bishop of Exeter!

“Οὐπη” αἰδοῦς “εἴσατο, πας δ’ ἄρα χαλκῶ.”
 “σμερδαλέῳ κεκάλωφθ”

Dr. Johnson made the remark, that if a man wrote a great deal, and wrote altogether in rhyme, he could not avoid sometimes, writing poetry. Among the multitude of Bishop Phillpots's hasty and incorrect assertions, we think that this, in

regard to the similarity of his own and Dr. Mant's doctrine to that of the Romish Church, is a happy strike upon a vein of truth, however incorrect the assertion may be when extended to the standards of the Church of England. Here we may well say, "*ab uno disce omnes.*" No intelligent theologian could believe that the men who wrote the third column in this parallelism, could also have written the first or second. Nor without great expansion of heart, could those who wrote the first and second have any sympathy with the third. The one is an exhibition of the broad and elevated spirit of Christian Protestantism; the other, of the narrow and bigoted spirit of Romanistic Judaism. The one, a religion of form, of sects, of sacraments; the other, a religion of power, of love, and of a sound mind. Nothing could be more humiliating than the exhibition of this narrow spirit of sectarianism, in the speeches of the two American Bishops, and one or two of those of England, during the services connected with this Jubilee. We are told by one, for instance, not of sinners being brought to Christ, but of Presbyterians being proselyted into the Episcopal Church. This narrowness of soul being reiterated by the Bishops of London and Exeter, and the colleague of this first speaker, capping the climax by the assertion that these Presbyterians, and "all others" out of the Episcopal Church, "are not of God!"

How suggestive of rejoicing, in all Christian enterprises, were the associations of the season which called these speakers together; but how miserably was it perverted into an occasion for the mere triumph of partizan bigotry—perverted into an attempt to make out, that the broad and catholic spirit, which pervades alike the English and American Churches, is not in existence; that those Churches are prepared to unite in a narrow sectarian movement to unchurch, and hand over to the uncovenanted mercies of God, all other bodies of Christian believers. And this, let the thoughtful reader bear in mind, was the topic of a great missionary occasion!—an occasion

upon which the speakers and hearers had come together to rejoice, not over proselyted Presbyterians, or the progress of episcopacy among dissenters, but the progress of Christ's Gospel, and true religion throughout the Christian world !

Not less suggestive of reflection, is the unity of sentiment between this sermon and the Oxford tract writers—two of whom are now in the Church of Rome—in regard to the subject of baptism. Here we find spiritual regeneration, invariably *opere operato*, tied, in every case, to the rite performed—denied to be attainable except through baptism; faith, repentance, love, and every other Christian grace, not being available without this he added: "Regeneration" is the gift bestowed by Him, in this life, "*in baptism only*," says Pusey. "Regeneration, which comes through baptism, is essential to Christian conversion," replies Wilberforce. "No other than baptismal regeneration is *possible* in this world," re-echoes Mant. "It is only to be accomplished in baptism," is the accordant statement of their docile American pupil—having conned his lesson passably well, and taking this first occasion which presented itself, for reciting it to such of his teachers as are still remaining in the Church of England. And all of these, quoting the text, with their own meaning of regeneration attached to it, unite in proclaiming, "Except a man be born again," that is, baptized, "he cannot enter the kingdom of God." As there are but two kingdoms—that of God, and that of Satan—all can see the inferential alternative. Baptism is made, not, as the Church has it, "generally," or "where it may be had," but absolutely and invariably, necessary for salvation.

Converted men, who have never been regenerated, with hearts full of penitence, faith, and love to God, are cast down to hell; and regenerated men, who have never been converted, although, as the Bishop of Michigan tells us, "children of God in Christ Jesus," in due time meet them there. Well might Pusey say, that upon his scheme, "the main object of the Gospel was not consolation."

We have thus performed an ungracious, but, as we conceive at this time, a necessary duty. We do not ask, nor have we any desire, that any one, into whose hands these pages may fall, shall take upon trust one word that is here recorded.* Our object will have been attained, if intelligent and moderate men, of all parties, are led to examine for themselves; to see the real explanation of certain facts connected with this mission to England

We do not yield to any man of any shade of ecclesiastical sentiment, in an earnest desire for Christian unity with the beloved mother Church of our mother country. But when this is possible, for which every Christian should earnestly pray, let it be such a union as good men can contemplate with approbation and confidence. Not the miserable alliance of two parties, entered into for the purpose of heightening the distractions of the whole bodies respectively; but the noble union and fraternity of all the good and the moderate in both. Not even the union of the bodies of both Churches in an anathematizing warfare upon Christians of every other name; but one of love and forbearance—yielding nothing of principle, but, like the noble-hearted fathers of the Reformation, moving freely and gladly in the higher sphere of brotherly love and Christian charity.

* The reader may verify the foregoing quotations, by referring to "Goode's work on Baptism," Bishop Hopkins's "Letters on Novelties," &c., and J. Mason Gallagher's "True Churchmanship Vindicated;" and, on the other side, the various books and tracts that have been mentioned

APPENDIX.

While the foregoing pages were in press, the following communication appeared in one of our Church papers, which not only vindicates the Bishop of Winchester from the grave charge of inviting the Bishop of Michigan to repeat, in his diocese, a sermon whose statements he was well known to repudiate; but which shows the tactics of a certain party, and the length they are ready to go in misrepresentation, even, if necessary to the accomplishment of their purposes.

BISHOP McCOSKRY'S SERMON IN St. PAUL'S, LONDON.

To the Editor of the Banner of the Cross.

DECEMBER 27TH, 1852.

REV. AND DEAR SIR.—Some time since there appeared in the *Banner of the Cross*, a paragraph concerning the sermon of the Bishop of Michigan, on his late visit to England to the effect (for I have not the paper before me,) that so far from its being censured in that country, as it was by some in this, that thanks, with loud applause, were returned for it by the Society at whose anniversary it was preached, and an unanimous request made for its publication; and that the Bishop of Winchester, brother to the present Archbishop of Canterbury, was so pleased with it as to desire that its author would preach it again at an approaching ordination in his diocese. Those who are acquainted with the doctrinal views and ecclesiastical position of the Bishop of Winchester, in relation to existing controversies and parties in the Church of England, were much surprised at such a statement, and could scarce believe that even the remarkable courtesy of that Bishop could betray him into such an inconsistency. One of his friends in this country, believing that there must be a mistake somewhere on this subject, and that it was due to the character of the Bishop of Winchester, and to the cause of truth, to ascertain the real facts of the case, has adopted a most certain method of accomplishing this object, and he does now undertake to declare that there is no foundation whatever for the report; that the Bishop of Winchester never had any conversation with Bishop McCoskry about the Sermon, never asked him to preach it, and would not have been guilty of the inconsistency of so doing. The writer of this article feels also justified in saying, that in England many who probably, differed little, if at all, from the views of the Sermon, regretted and censured the introduction of such topics on so peculiar an occasion. Inasmuch as the erroneous statement was not corrected at the time, but has been transferred to other Church papers, and still remains uncontradicted, it is deemed proper to make this communication.

A FRIEND TO THE BISHOP OF WINCHESTER.